10th October 1928]

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar :—" May I ask the Government to publish the report and then discuss it in the House ? ".

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" It is a suggestion, Sir, which will be duly considered."

Memorial submitted to His Excellency the Governor by ryots and mirasidars of Kadarambam parts.

* 461 Q. - Mr. J. A. Saldanha : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether memorial was presented to His Excellency the Governor in the first week of September 1928, signed by a large number of the ryots and mirasidars of the Kadarambam parts of the Kulittalai and Trichinopoly taluks ;

(*b*) if so, what action the Government propose to take in the matter ;

(*c*) whether the Government have decided or propose to extend the area of irrigation in the Trichinopoly district by carrying out the Kattalai scheme ;

(*d*) whether they have decided or propose to reconsider the whole question in the light of the above memorial and modify the terms of the G.O. No. 1974 I., dated the 16th December 1926, so as to benefit the Trichinopoly district also under the Mettur scheme ; and

(*e*) whether more than 10,000 acres of wet lands were silted up during the floods of 1924 and whether the Government have any scheme for the utilization of the unused water for irrigating other lands ?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*d*) The memorial has been received and is under the consideration of the Government.

(*e*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (*e*) of question No. 506.

Mr. J. A. Saldanha :—" As to answers on all these points, may I take it that the Mettur Project will be utilized for the benefit of the lands of the memorialists ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" That is the question, Sir, which has to be investigated by the Engineers."

Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar :—" With regard to the answer to (*e*), may I know, Sir, whether the consideration that is promised will be so comprehensive as to include the adoption of any other scheme than the one mentioned here ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" I do not know which investigation the hon. Member refers to."

Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar :—" With reference to (*e*), the answer is that the attention of the hon. Member is invited to clause (*e*) of 506."

The hon. the President :—" Apparently it must be clause (*d*) of 506."

Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar :—" Yes. The answer from (*a*) to (*d*) is that the memorial has been received and is under the consideration of the Government. Then so far, the only scheme which is under consideration is the High Level channel scheme connected with the Right Bank canal. My question is whether the hon. Member will tell me if the consideration promised here will be so comprehensive as to include the adoption of any scheme for the benefit of these lands in addition to the high level channel."

[10th October 1928

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Yes, Sir. I believe there is an investigation in connexion with the Uyyakondan."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"Sir, there is mention made of a few thousand acres that have been silted up and do not require water for irrigation at present. May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member to tell me whether in consideration of this fact he will also consider a scheme to irrigate the Kadarambam parts?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Government would be very glad indeed if that can be done. It is entirely a question for the Irrigation Engineer whether they can get water on to the land."

Levy of penal rate in breach irrigation with reference to the cultivator.

*462 Q.—Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that in calculating the number of offences with a view to levy penal rate with reference to breach irrigation, reference is had to the land irrigated and not to the individual ryot cultivating the lands; and

(*b*) if so, whether the Government would adopt the practice of having reference to the cultivator and not to the lands?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member will find set out on page 28 of Volume II of the Board's Standing Orders the rules for the levy of water-cess for water irregularly taken for irrigation.

(*b*) The suggestion appears to be based on the supposition that enhanced rates for irregular irrigation are charged with the object of punishing the person for the offence of taking the water. This is not so. The object of the rules is to prevent the irregular use of irrigation supplies. It is therefore the supply irregularly taken to a particular land that is charged for at progressively increasing rates irrespective of the taker or takers.

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"With reference to the answer to clause (*a*), 11-15 a.m. may I know whether the recovery of the rent is going to be made from the person who uses the water or no?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"It will be made under the provisions of the Revenue Recovery Act."

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"May I know whether the person who takes the water is responsible or it is merely the land?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"I think under the Revenue Recovery Act, the person responsible is the pattadar."

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"The last part of the answer says, 'It is therefore the supply irregularly taken to a particular land that is charged for at progressively increasing rates irrespective of the taker or takers'. May I put the question to the hon. the Revenue Member this way? Supposing a person comes into possession of the land either by purchase for the first time or becomes a lessee and makes irregular use of water ignorant of the fact that water was previously taken irregularly for that land, will it not be a hardship in such cases to charge progressive rates with reference to the land?"